

60. The method as claimed in claim 50, further comprising the step of end-rounding a free end of the bristle.

61. The method as claimed in claim 55, wherein the step of twisting further comprises drawing the monofilament from a rotating central reel.

62. The method as claimed in claim 55, wherein the step of twisting further comprises drawing the monofilament from a stationary central reel through a rotating nozzle. --

REMARKS

This application originated in Germany, and this Second Preliminary Amendment (whose filing was indicated as intended by the First Preliminary Amendment filed March 9, 2001) is believed to place the claims in a form that is more consistent with practice in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, to advance the prosecution by e.g. amending possibly indefinite expressions, and to secure applicants' rights in the invention. Generally, the previous claims have been canceled and replaced with claims to avoid alternate expressions in the dependent claims. Claims 24-62 are now presented, apparatus claim 24 and method claim 50 being independent. Claims 24-49 are apparatus claims, 50-62 are method claims.

Advantages of the present invention are seen in that the free end of a bristle constructed according to the disclosed embodiments can be slit or split to create high-surface-area teeth-cleaning bristle-lets without complicated equipment or extra processing steps such as slitting tools, rather, the zones define a pre-selected breaking region between them that allows a simple mechanical bristle end-rounding ("grinding/polishing") or beating to splay the bristle ends, as described in the specification at page 2, last paragraph.

Appreciation is expressed for the courtesy of Examiner's indicating to Applicant's undersigned on October 24th of the intended grouping of a possible election/restriction requirement. Attempts to reach Examiner on Thursday, Oct. 25, 2001 to discuss filing this

Second Preliminary Amendment were unsuccessful, his answering machine indicating that his return to the Office would not be before Monday October 29th, a date after the term Examiner had indicated he would give the undersigned to respond with a telephonic election. Furthermore, attempts on like date to reach Examiner's SPE Ms. Cynthia Kelley to discuss advancing this case by simultaneously filing this Amendment were unsuccessful, and a telephone message was left.

Solely as a convenience to Examiner in initial review of the application, a list associating the new and previous (now canceled) apparatus claims is noted below, which is not intended to be limiting of the claim scope:

Apparatus:	Claim 24	Claim 1
	Claims 25, 26, 27	Claim 2
	Claims 28, 29, 30, 31	Claim 3
	Claim 32	Claim 4
	Claims 33, 34	Claim 5
	Claim 35	Claim 6
	Claim 36	Claim 7
	Claim 37	Claim 8
	Claim 38	Claim 9
	Claim 39	Claim 10
	Claims 40, 41, 42	Claim 11
	Claim 43	Claim 12
	Claim 44	Claim 13
	Claim 45, 46, 47	Claim 14

For exemplary purposes, the embodiment discussed in relation to Figures 1a,b, 2a,b relates to features of at least claims 24-26 and 28-42. In particular, with regard to claim 32 (original claim 4), not only is reference made to the extrusion die at Fig. 2a, but also to the text describing Fig. 1a,b at page 8, lines 4-10 (and also to Fig. 2b).

Claim 45 is directed to the feature that the cavity (referred to in claim 27) contains a plastic material introduced into the space defining the cavity. Claim 45 is written dependent on claim 27. It is noted that the subject of claims 45-47 is discussed in the text at e.g. page 10, lines 16-20, which describes that the boundary defining the cavity can, in certain embodiments, be filled

with the introduced plastic, and that the plastic can be a plastic different from the plastic that forms the boundary walls of the cavity, the interface between different plastics refused from the melt stream resulting in a pre-selected region of breakage due to a weaker bond strength at the interface than if they were melt streams of the same material.

If Examiner is considering placing the claims directed to a "cavity" in a different group for examination, then it is proposed that he consider only placing claims 27, 45-47 in such a group. Claims 27, 43 and 45-49 read on, for example, the embodiment shown in the various Figures 3.

If a telephone conference would helpfully advance prosecution, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 617-421-7939.

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 07-1350.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward S. Podszus
Reg. No. 35,983
Attorney for Applicants

Date: October 26, 2001

Patent Department
The Gillette Company
Prudential Tower Building
Boston, MA 02199
(617) 421-7939 (EST)